

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-6 and 11-14 were pending in this application.

Claims 1-6 and 11-14 were rejected.

Claims 6-10, 12 and 13 were cancelled.

New Claim 15 was added.

Claims 1 and 11 were amended.

### **I. DRAWINGS**

The drawings were rejected for failing to show feature "32". Fig. 3 has been amended. A substitute sheet is provided with the drawings corrections for the Examiner's review.

FIG. 5 was objected to because reference number "32" should be --52--. A substitute sheet containing this correction is provided.

### **II. 35 USC 112 Rejections**

The Examiner rejected Claims 6 and 11 under 35 USC 112. Claim 6 has been deleted. Claim 11 has been amended to remove the stated cause of rejection. All claims are now believed to be in proper form.

### **III. 35 USC 102 (e) Rejections**

**The Examiner has rejected Claim 1 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,691,596 to Singh**

Claim 1 sets forth a method of forming an arbor mounting hole in a circular blade. The method includes providing a circular blade having a geometric center point. An arbor mounting hole is formed in the circular blade. The arbor mounting hole is symmetrically shaped about either side of an imaginary mid-line. However, the mid-line of the arbor mounting hole does not

extend through the geometric center point of the circular blade.

Accordingly, although the arbor mounting hole is symmetrical, it is off-set away from the center of the blade.

This method, and its resulting structure, is not disclosed by the cited prior art.

**The Singh patent** discloses a blade for cutting cement board. The Singh blade has a complex peripheral shape. However, as is clearly stated in column 4, lines 63-65, the Singh blade is *“a plate 122 having a hole 124 defined in the center thereof for mounting the saw blade 122 into an arbor”*. In other words, the arbor mounting hole (124) of the Singh blade is located in the center of the blade.

In the Office Action, the Examiner states that the Singh blade has “a geometric center point 140” that is offset from the center of the arbor hole. (See Office Action, bottom page 4, top of page 5).

This is completely wrong and is a misstatement of the disclosure of the Singh patent. As is clear from Fig. 4, the offset center 140 is **not** the center of the blade. It is clear that the offset center is merely the imaginary starting point of radius line R3. Radius line R3 is used to create sections on the peripheral edge of the blade.

The Applicant’s position is fully supported by the text of the Singh patent. In column 5, lines 4-8 of the Singh patent, the following is stated:

*“The radius R3 of the offset arc of the receding tooth support portion 130 is angled at 56.62 degrees clockwise from the centerline 141 and the offset center is offset by a distance H of approximately 0.57 inches from the center 125 along the radius R3.”*

In other words, the center of rotation for the radius line R3 is offset 0.57 inches from the center of the blade.

The Singh patent makes absolutely no disclosure regarding the arbor hole 124 being offset. Rather, the Singh patent clearly states that the arbor hole 124 is in the center of the blade. (See Col 4, line 53) The only mentioning of offsets is used to describe imaginary points for the origin of radius lines that create the periphery of the blade.

Since the Singh patent does not disclose a symmetric arbor hole that is offset from the center of a blade, the Singh patent clearly does not anticipate the matter of Claim 1. The Examiner's 35 USC 102 rejection should therefore be withdrawn.

#### **IV. 35 USC 103 Rejections**

**The Examiner has rejected Claim 2 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Singh in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,477,845 to Zuzelo.**

Claim 2 depends from Claim 1. Claim 1 is distinguishable over the Singh patent for the reasons previously presented. The cited Zuzelo patent does not address the deficiencies of the Singh patent as applied to Claim 1. Like the Singh patent, the Zuzelo patent does not disclose or suggest an arbor hole that is symmetric about a line, where that line is offset from the center of the blade.

Accordingly, in combination, the Singh patent and the Zuzelo patent both fail to disclose the matter of Claim 1 and its dependent claims. It is therefore respectfully requested that the Examiner's 35 USC 103 rejection be withdrawn.

**The Examiner has rejected Claim 4 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Singh in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,477,845 to Zuzelo and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,846,223 to Conley.**

Claim 4 depends from Claim 1. Claim 1 is distinguishable over the Singh patent for the reasons previously presented. In combination, the cited Zuzelo and Conley patents do not address the deficiencies of the Singh patent as applied to Claim 1. Like the Singh patent, neither the Zuzelo patent nor the Conley patent discloses or suggests an arbor hole that is symmetric about a line, where that line is offset from the center of the blade.

Accordingly, in combinations the Singh patent with both the Zuzelo and Conley patents

fails to disclose the matter of Claim 1 and its dependent claims. It is therefore respectfully requested that the Examiner's 35 USC 103 rejection be withdrawn.

**The Examiner has rejected Claim 11 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Singh in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,729,220 to Curtsinger.**

Claim 11 is an independent claim that sets forth a method of forming an arbor mounting hole in a circular blade. In accordance with the claimed method, a circular blade is provided that has a geometric center. An arbor hole is formed in the circular blade. The arbor hole has at least five straight side edges. The side edges include two long side edges that intersect at a first angle, wherein that first angle is bisected by an imaginary mid-line. The imaginary mid-line, however, is offset from the geometric center of said circular blade.

As has been previously mentioned, the Singh patent makes absolutely no disclosure regarding the arbor hole being offset. Rather, the Singh patent clearly states that the arbor hole 124 is in the center of the blade. (See Singh, Col 4, line 53) The only mentioning of offsets is used to describe imaginary points for the origin of radius lines that create the periphery of the blade.

The Curtsinger patent is cited to show the use of inserts in a blade. Like the Singh patent, the Curtsinger patent does not disclose or suggests an arbor hole having long edges that are symmetric about a line, where that line is offset from the center of the blade.

Accordingly, in combination, the Singh patent and the Curtsinger patent fail to disclose the matter of Claim 11 and its dependent claims. It is therefore respectfully requested that the Examiner's 35 USC 103 rejection be withdrawn.

**The Examiner has rejected Claims 12-14 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Singh in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,477,845 to Zuzelo and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,846,223 to Conley and U.S. Patent Number 6,729,220 to Curtsinger.**


Claim 14 depends from Claim 11. Claim 11 is distinguishable over the Singh patent for the reasons previously presented. In combination, the cited Zuzelo, Curtsinger and Conley patents do not address the deficiencies of the Singh patent as applied to Claim 1. Like the Singh patent, the Zuzelo, Curtsinger and Conley patents fail to disclose or suggests an arbor hole having long side edges that are symmetric about a line, where that line is offset from the center of the blade.

Accordingly, in combinations the Singh patent the Zuzelo, Curtsinger and Conley patents fail to disclose the matter of Claim 1 and its dependent claims. It is therefore respectfully requested that the Examiner's 35 USC 103 rejection be withdrawn.

#### **V. SUMMARY**

Having fully distinguished the pending claims over the cited art, this application is believed to stand in condition for allowance. However, if the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is requested to call the applicant's attorney at (215) 321-6772 in order that any outstanding issues may be resolved without the necessity of issuing a further Office Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

  
Eric A. LaMorte  
Reg. No. 34,653  
Attorney For Applicant

LaMorte & Associates  
P.O. BOX 434  
Yardley, PA 19067  
(215) 321-6772